

Minutes:
Consolidated Billing Subcommittee Meeting

Thursday, August 17, 2000, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.
Salt River Project, 1600 North Priest Dr., Tempe, Arizona 85281

	Topic	Lead	Outcome	Att.
1	Welcome, Intro, Sign-In	Shirley Renfroe	Larry Nuszloch (SRP Competitive Provider Services) welcomed subcommittee members to the Salt River Project building. Shirley Renfroe (Pinnacle West) formally opened the meeting. Participants introduced themselves and signed the attendance sheet. Members were informed that lunch was being provided by Barry Scott (Sulphur Springs Valley Electric Cooperative).	1
2	Review Minutes from Subcommittee Meeting (7/20/2000)	Shirley Renfroe	Minutes from the July 20, 2000 subcommittee meeting were reviewed. Members adopted corrections that were proposed by Gene Slechta (SRP) on item no. 5, and Mr. Nuszloch on Item no. 6. Members were informed that a corrected copy of the 7/20 minutes would be sent out via e-mail.	
3	Updates from VEE and Metering Subcommittee Meetings	Stacy Aquayo	<p>Stacy Aguayo (APS) updated Subcommittee members on the VEE and Metering Subcommittee meetings held on August 15 and 16, 2000.</p> <p>During this segment of the meeting Marilyn Ferrara (APS Energy Services) raised the issue of a possible disconnect between the BEN and MADEN processes (the billing group is using a BEN to notice problem billings while the metering group is using the MADEN process for MRSP's to advise UDC's that they will not get an additional file after an estimated file).</p>	

4	Discuss Possible Methods for Handling Questionable Bills that are Issued Between the Time that a Customer Goes DA and then Switches Back to Standard Offer or Chooses a Different MRSP or ESP	Shirley Renfroe	<p>Members responded to a list of questions sent out prior to the meeting by Ms. Aguayo (Action Item No.1 attached to the 8/17 Agenda).</p> <p>The question of whether or not the electric restructuring rules should be modified to allow estimated reads on final bills was discussed (Action Item No.1, Question #1). Janie Mollon, (New West Energy) recommended that the question be raised with members of the ACC during the PSWG large group as opposed to being treated as an action item. Ms. Renfroe tabled questions #1, #4 and #5 for the next Consolidated Billing Subcommittee meeting scheduled for September 12, 2000.</p> <p>On Question #2, all of the organizations represented, with the exception of APS, reported that they could wait 5 days for meter read data. Representatives from TEP stated that their organization wants to be consistent with the 5-day window, and believes that MRSP's must use the MADEN process if data is not received within the 5-day window (TEP wants to double check their processes). Representatives from SRP stated that they want data in 5 business days from the MRSP. Representatives from APS stated that they would try to get meter read data within seven days. The APS representatives also stated that they do not want to estimate on their own and that they want an estimate or an actual read from the MRSP. Members discussed how rebills will be treated after a customer has been finaled. Ms. Mollon believed that commercial customers should not be a problem due to IDR meters but the situation with residential customers will be different. Ms. Mollon also believed that a customer may be rebilled if the MDMA submits a better file (depending on the customer and the dollar amount). Ms. Renfroe decided to continue the discussion on Question No. 2 at the next scheduled Consolidated Billing meeting.</p> <p>Action Item: Ms. Mollon will check on the California rule on when data is due from the MRSP on a final bill and what the rebill rules are.</p> <p>The general consensus among members on Question #3 was that the ESP is responsible for estimated final reads since they contract with the MRSP.</p> <p>Action item for next meeting: Revisit the questions in Action Item No. 1 for the 8/17 Consolidated Billing meeting (Attachment No. 2).</p>	2
5	Discuss Non-metered Accounts	Shirley Renfroe	<p>Members continued a discussion about the scenario where a customer goes DA and has metered usage and non-metered usage such as dusk to dawn lights. The lights are not part of the DA request (members had concluded previously that it would not make sense for a non-metered account customer to get a separate bill for non DA items such as dusk to dawn lights or security systems). Representatives from Citizens preferred two separate bills while APS Energy Services believed that the customer should have the choice of how he or she wants to be billed. APS believed that it was a non-issue at this time. After weighing this particular issue with more pressing matters that need to be resolved by the subcommittee, Ms. Renfroe decided to continue the discussion on this particular issue at an unspecified future meeting.</p>	
6	Review Definitions for Charge Codes To Be Used on the EDI 810	Shirley Renfroe	<p>Members were asked to forward definitions to Ms. Renfroe so that they can be compiled).</p>	

7	Review Definitions for Charge Codes To Be Used on the EDI 810 and Continue Discussion and Finalization of the EDI 810 for ESP Consolidated Billing	Shirley Renfro	<p>Mr. Slechta presented a handout (Attachment No. 3) of changes to the Arizona Electric EDI Standards (810 (Invoice) for ESP Consolidated Billing Implementation Guide). Mr. Slechta guided members through the changes made to the document since the last meeting. Mr. Slechta also discussed issues related to the handout (i.e. charge codes values vs. maintenance and inability to associate account level charges with billing period in cancel/rebill). Members proposed putting account level charges in the detail level as opposed to the summary level and discussed identifying corrected and original BIG data by stating "Corrected" for active customers and final customers (which would not any original charges). During the discussion, members raised the question of how to handle additional codes that are not matched with UIG codes. Mr. Slechta recommended using current categories and to pass a description (the issue with this is that the ESP may need to know what the charge is in order to code their systems). New West Energy preferred to stick with UIG codes. Ms Renfro believed that the subcommittee should recommend specific codes that would be submitted to UIG.</p> <p>In regard to Action Item No. 2, the consensus among members was that the header date on ESP consolidated billing statements should be the date range of the current billing period as opposed to the entire range that the statement covers.</p> <p>Ms. Renfro recommended a meeting with 810 and EDI technical people be proposed at the large PSWG meeting.</p>	3
8	Items for Next Meeting (agenda)	Shirley Renfro	<p>The agenda for the September 14, 2000 meeting will be sent out with the meeting minutes. The location for the meeting will be as follows:</p> <p>Basement Conference Room - Hall of Fame Museum, 1101 West Washington, Phoenix, AZ 85007</p>	
9	Suspend Meeting	Shirley Renfro	<p>The meeting was suspended at 12:00 p.m.</p>	

Attachment No. 1 - Consolidated Billing Subcommittee

ARIZONA PROCESS STANDARDIZATION WORKING GROUP

Consolidated Billing Subcommittee

July 20, 2000 Attendance List

[illegible]

Attachment No. 2 - Consolidated Billing Subcommittee

ACTION ITEMS FOR THE AUGUST 17, 2000 MEETING

Action Item No. 1

Please be prepared to discuss these items as well as any other information your company may have related to these issues.

1. The Rules say that the Final Bills can not be estimated. If we do not have meter data, what should the process be?
2. How long should the providers (UDC and ESP) be required to wait for the meter data to bill the DA Final Bill?
3. If we are allowed to estimate DA Final Bills and the MRSP does not provide the data, who is responsible? The ESP or the UDC?
4. Can we identify a Rule change that would allow us to estimate DA Final Bills when the data can not be retrieved from the meter. Who will handle customer disputes and what will the process be?
5. For monthly bills, how many months have to pass before we say we will not accept back data to cancel rebill?

Action Item No. 2

Members need to determine if the header date on ESP consolidated billing statements should be the entire range that the statement covers or if it should just list the date of the current billing period.